Basic Concepts

Introduction

Sociology (from Latin: socius, "companion"; and the suffix -ology, "the study of", from Greek Î»ÏŒÎ³Î¿Ï‚, lÃ³gos, "knowledge" [1]) is the scientific study of society, including patterns of social relationships, social interaction, and culture[2]. Areas studied in sociology can range from the analysis of brief contacts between anonymous individuals on the street to the study of global social interaction. Numerous fields within the discipline concentrate on how and why people are organized in society, either as individuals or as members of associations, groups, and institutions. As an academic discipline, sociology is usually considered a branch of social science

Sociological research provides educators, planners, lawmakers, administrators, developers, business leaders, and people interested in resolving social problems and formulating public policy with rationales for the actions that they take.

Society

The term society is most fundamental to sociology. It is derived from the Latin word socius which means companionship or friendship. Companionship means sociability. According to George Simmel it is this element of sociability which defines the true essence of society. It indicates that man always lives in the company of other people. Man is a social animal said Aristotle centuries ago. Man needs society for his living, working and enjoying life. Society has become an essential condition for human life to continue. We can define society as a group of people who share a common culture, occupy a particular territorial area and feel themselves to constitute a unified and distinct entity. It is the mutual interactions and interrelations of individuals and groups.

Definitions of Society

August Comte the father of sociology saw society as a social organism possessing a harmony of structure and function.Emile Durkheim the founding father of the modern sociology treated society as a reality in its own right. According to Talcott Parsons Society is a total complex of human relationships in so far as they grow out of the action in terms of means-end relationship intrinsic or symbolic.G.H Mead conceived society as an exchange of gestures which involves the use of symbols. Morris Ginsberg defines society as a collection of individuals united by certain relations or mode of behavior which mark them off from others who do not enter into these relations or who differ from them in behavior. Cole sees Society as the complex of organized associations and institutions with a community. According to MacIver and Page society is a system of usages and procedures of authority and mutual aid of many groupings and divisions, of controls of human behavior and liberties. This ever changing complex system which is called society is a web of social relationship

Types of Societies

Writers have classified societies into various categories Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft of Tonnies, mechanical and organic solidarities of Durkheim, status and contract of Maine, and militant and industrial societies of Spencer. All these thinkers have broadly divided society into pre-industrial and post-industrial societies. Sociologists like Comte based their classification of societies on intellectual development.

Most of them concede the evolutionary nature of society- one type leading to the other. One more way of dividing societies is that of Marx. His classification of society is based on the institutional framework of society as determined by a group of people who control the means of production. Marx distinguishes five principal types of societies: primitive, Asiatic, ancient, feudal and capitalist.

Following these classifications, sociologists often refer to societies as primitive or modern non-literate or literate. A more recent kind of classification which is also used while distinguishing societies into types is the one between open and closed societies. A closed society is the one which is a traditional and simple society or a totalitarian State tends to resist change, while an open society admits change.

None of these classifications is accurate; for every major type have number of sub-types. One type like the capitalist can be of various kinds like carboniferous type, finance capital, and the modern neo-colonial or multi-national type. Further, it is to be borne in mind that the chief task of a sociologist is not that of identifying societies but finding out whether a particular kind of society has the potential to nurture, defend and survive. Such a study alone can reveal the sociological aspects of societies and thereby facilitating understanding of societies as they are, and, if need be, activate the required changes. In other words, sociology based on values relies on objective analysis of societies.

However, in recent years there have been several studies of what are variously called irrigation civilization or hydraulic societies. These studies have been related to the general study of bureaucracy, but little has yet been done in the way of large scale comparative work of various complex organized societies. It is not enough, however, to characterize pre-British India as an irrigation civilization with a centralized bureaucracy and a village system of production. The unity and stability of Indian society depended also upon two other factors, caste and religion. There, the aspect of caste to be emphasized is not so much its rigid hierarchical character and the way in which it divided groups from each other, as its integrating function, closely connected with religion.

M.N. Srinivas, in a discussion of Indian social structure, observes that caste guarantees autonomy to a community into relation with numerous other communities all going to form a hierarchy. The importance of such an institution is obvious in a vast country like India which has been the meeting place of many different cultures in the past and which has always had considerable regional diversity. While the autonomy of a sub- caste was preserved it was also brought into relation with others and the

hierarchy was also a scale of generally agreed values.

The work of K. Wittfoged suggests that many important similarities can be found, in ancient Egypt, in Byzantium and elsewhere especially in the social functions of the priests and in the elements and caste revealed in detailed regulation of the division of labor. Each human group develops its own social and political structure in terms of its own culture and history. There broad types of social structures may be distinguished. First, the tribal society represented by the social structures of African tribes second, the agrarian social structure represented by the traditional Indian society. And the third, the industrial social structure represented by the industrially advanced countries Europe and U.S.A. Sociologists also speak of yet another type, called postindustrial society, which is emerging out of the industrial society.

Community

The term community is one of the most elusive and vague in sociology and is by now largely without specific meaning. At the minimum it refers to a collection of people in a geographical area. Three other elements may also be present in any usage. (1) Communities may be thought of as collections of people with a particular social structure; there are, therefore, collections which are not communities. Such a notion often equates community with rural or pre-industrial society and may, in addition, treat urban or industrial society as positively destructive. (2) A sense of belonging or community spirit. (3) All the daily activities of a community, work and non work, take place within the geographical area, which is self-contained. Different accounts of community will contain any or all of these additional elements.

We can list out the characteristics of a community as follows:

1. Territory
2. Close and informal relationships
3. Mutuality
4. Common values and beliefs
5. Organized interaction
6. Strong group feeling
7. Cultural similarity

Talcott Parsons defined community as collectivity the members of which share a common territorial area as their base of operation for daily activities. According to Tonnies community is defined as an organic natural kind of social group whose members are bound together by the sense of belonging, created out of everyday contacts covering the whole range of human activities. He has presented ideal-typical pictures of the forms of social associations contrasting the solidarity nature of the social relations in the community with the large scale and impersonal relations thought to characterize industrializing societies. Kingsley Davis defined it as the smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social

life. For Karl Mannheim community is any circle of people who live together and belong together in such a way that they do not share this or that particular interest only but a whole set of interests.

Association

Men have diverse needs, desires and interests which demand satisfaction. There are three ways of fulfilling these needs. Firstly they may act independently each in his own way without caring for others. This is unsocial with limitations. Secondly men may seek their ends through conflicts with one another. Finally men may try to fulfill their ends through cooperation and mutual assistance.

This cooperation has a reference to association.

When a group or collection of individuals organize themselves expressly for the purpose of pursuing certain of its interests together on a cooperative pursuit an association is said to be born. According to Morris Ginsberg an association is a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they possess or have instituted in common an organization with a view to securing a specific end or specific ends. The associations may be found in different fields. No single association can satisfy all the interests of the individual or individuals. Since Man has many interests, he organizes various associations for the purpose of fulfilling varied interests. He may belong to more than one organization.

Main characteristics of Association:

Association: An association is formed or created by people. It is a social group. Without people there can be no association. It is an organized group. An unorganized group like crowd or mob cannot be an association.

Common interest: An association is not merely a collection of individuals. It consists of those individuals who have more or less the same interests. Accordingly those who have political interests may join political association and those who have religious interests may join religious associations and so on.

Cooperative spirit: An association is based on the cooperative spirit of its members. People work together to achieve some definite purposes. For example a political party has to work together as a united group on the basis of cooperation in order to fulfill its objective of coming to power.

Organization: Association denotes some kind of organization. An association is known essentially as an organized group. Organization gives stability and proper shape to an association. Organization refers to the way in which the statuses and roles are distributed among the members.

Regulation of relations: Every association has its own ways and means of regulating the relation of its members. Organization depends on this element of regulation. They may assume written or unwritten forms.

Association as agencies: Associations are means or agencies through which their members seek to realize their similar or shared interests. Such social organizations necessarily act not merely through leaders but through officials or representatives as agencies. Associations normally act through agents who are responsible for and to the association.

Durability of association: An association may be permanent or temporary. There are some long standing associations like the state; family, religious associations etc.Some associations may be temporary in nature.

Social Institutions

A social institution is a complex, integrated set of social norms organized around the preservation of a basic societal value. Obviously, the sociologist does not define institutions in the same way as does the person on the street. Lay persons are likely to use the term "institution" very loosely, for churches, hospitals, jails, and many other things as institutions.

Sociologists often reserve the term "institution" to describe normative systems that operate in five basic areas of life, which may be designated as the primary institutions.

(1) In determining Kinship;

(2) in providing for the legitimate use of power;

(3) in regulating the distribution of goods and services;

(4) in transmitting knowledge from one generation to the next; and

(5) in regulating our relation to the supernatural.

In shorthand form, or as concepts, these five basic institutions are called the family, government, economy, education and religion.

The five primary institutions are found among all human groups. They are not always as highly elaborated or as distinct from one another as into the United States, but, in rudimentary form at last, they exist everywhere. Their universality indicates that they are deeply rooted in human nature and that they are essential in the development and maintenance of orders. Sociologists operating in terms of the functionalist model society have provided the clearest explanation of the functions served by social institutions. Apparently there are certain minimum tasks that must be performed in all human groups.

Unless these tasks are performed adequately, the group will cease to exist. An analogy may help to make the point. We might hypothesize that cost accounting department is essential to the operation of

a large corporation. A company might procure a superior product and distribute it then at the price which is assigned to it, the company will soon go out of business. Perhaps the only way to avoid this is to have a careful accounting of the cost of each step in the production and distribution process.

Culture

As Homo sapiens, evolved, several biological characteristics particularly favorable to the development of culture appeared in the species. These included erect posture; a favorable brain structure; stereoscopic vision; the structure of the hand, a flexible shoulder; and year round sexual receptivity on the part of the female. None of these biological characteristics alone, of course, accounts for the development of culture. Even in combination, all they guarantee is that human beings would be the most gifted members of the animal kingdom.

The distinctive human way of life that we call culture did not have a single definite beginning in time any more than human beings suddenly appearing on earth. Culture evolved slowly just as some anthropoids gradually took on more human form. Unmistakably, tools existed half a million years ago and might be considerably older. If, for convenience, we say that culture is 500,000 years old, it is still difficult day has appeared very recently.

The concept of culture was rigorously defined by E.B. Taylor in 1860s. According to him culture is the sum total of ideas, beliefs, values, material cultural equipments and non-material aspects which man makes as a member of society. Taylor's theme that culture is a result of human collectivity has been accepted by most anthropologists. Tylarian idea can be discerned in a modern definition of culture - culture is the man-made part of environment (M.J. Herskovits).

From this, it follows that culture and society are separable only at the analytical level: at the actual existential level, they can be understood as the two sides of the same coin. Culture, on one hand, is an outcome of society and, on the other hand, society is able to survive and perpetuate itself because of the existence of culture. Culture is an ally of man in the sense that it enhances man's adaptability to nature. It is because of the adaptive value of culture that Herskovits states that culture is a screen between man and nature. Culture is an instrument by which man exploits the environment and shapes it accordingly.

In showing affection, the Maori rub noses; the Australians rub faces; the Chinese place nose to cheeks; the Westerners kiss; some groups practice spitting on the beloved. Or, consider this; American men are permitted to laugh in public but not to cry; Iroquois men are permitted to do neither in public; Italian men are permitted to do both. Since this is true, physiological factors have little to do with when men laugh and cry and when they do not do either. The variability of the human experience simply cannot be explained by making reference to human biology, or to the climate and geography. Instead, we must consider culture as the fabric of human society.

Culture can be conceived as a continuous, cumulative reservoir containing both material and non-material elements that are socially transmitted from generation to generation. Culture is continuous because cultural patterns transcend years, reappearing in successive generations. Culture is cumulative because each generation contributes to the reservoir.

An inherent paradox exists within the social heritage where culture tends to be both static and dynamic. Humans, once having internalized culture, attach positive value judgments to it and are more or less reluctant to change their established ways of life. Through most of recorded history men have apparently considered that change per say is undesirable and that the ideal condition is stability. The prospect of change can seem threatening, yet every human culture is subject to and does experience change. Those who speak of a generation gap portray two generations at odds with each other.

According to this view, the parent generation embodied the dynamic dimension. We contend that if, in fact, a generation gap does exist in modern societies, and the differences are of degree and not of substance. Part of the social heritage of almost every modern society is the high value placed on progress. Parents encourage young people to seek progress, and progress is a form of social change. Debates between generations in modern societies are seldom about whether any change should occur. The debates are usually about how such change should occur, how fast it should occur, and which methods should be used for bringing about change.

The Development of Culture

The distinctive human way of life that we call culture did not have a single definite beginning. This is to say that human beings did not suddenly appear on earth. Culture evolved slowly just as anthropoids gradually took on more human form. The earliest tools cannot be dated precisely. Australopithecus may have used stones as weapons as long as five million years ago. Stones that have been used as weapon do not differ systematically from other stones, however, and there is no way to tell for sure. The first stones that show reliable evidence of having been shaped as tools trace back some 500,000 to 600,000 years. The use of fire can be dated from 200,000 to 300,000 years ago.

Tools of bone had come into existence by 100,000 B.C. the age of Neanderthals. The Neanderthals also apparently had some form of languages and buried their deal with an elaborateness that indicates the possibility of religious ceremonies. Cro-Magnon, dating from 35,000 years ago, was a superior biological specimen and had a correspondingly more elaborate culture. Their cave paintings have been found. They also made jewelry of shells and teeth, and carved statuettes of women that emphasized pregnancy and fertility. They made weapons of bone, horn, and ivory, and used needle in the fabrication of garments.

Thus, a striking parallel appears between the evolution of Homo sapiens and the development of culture. The parallel cannot be drawn in detail because all inferences to the period before the dawn of

history must be made from material artifacts, and these tell little about the total way of life of the people who used them. Moreover, the parallel between biological and cultural evolution should not be overdrawn. Cro-Magnon's brain capacity, for example, was large, but factors having to do with the growth of culture itself were sufficient to prevent any quantum leap in the development of learned behavior.

Diffusion

In spite of the fact that invention occupied a dominant place in culture growth over such a long period of time, most of the content of modern cultures appears to have been gained through diffusion. The term diffusion refers to the borrowing of cultural elements from other societies in contrast to their independent invention within a host society

In order for diffusion to operate on a substantial scale, there must be separate societies that have existed long enough to have elaborated distinctive ways of life. Moreover, those societies must be in contact with one another so that substantial borrowing is possible. These conditions probably developed late in the evolutionary process. Once begun, however, culture borrowing became so pervasive that most of the elements of most modern cultures, including our own, originated with other people.

Culture has grown, then, through a combination of invention and diffusion. It grew slowly at first, mostly as the result of invention. As the culture base expanded and societies became differentiated, the large - scale diffusion of traits become possible and the rate of growth speeded up. In modern times, and particularly in the Western world, the rate of culture growth has become overwhelming.

Cultural Lag

The role played by material inventions, that is, by technology, in social change probably received most emphasis in the work of William F. Ogburn. It was Ogburn, also, who was chiefly responsible for the idea that the rate of invention within society is a function of the size of the existing culture base. He saw the rate of material invention as increasing with the passage of time.Ogburn believed that material and non-material cultures change in different ways. Change in material culture is believed to have a marked directional or progressive character. This is because there are agreed-upon standards of efficiency that are used to evaluate material inventions. To use air-planes, as an example, we keep working to develop planes that will fly, higher and faster, and carry more payloads on a lower unit cost. Because airplanes can be measured against these standards, inventions in this area appear rapidly and predictably.

In the area of non-material culture, on the other hand there often are no such generally accepted standards. Whether one prefers a Hussain, a Picasso, or a Gainsborough, for example, is a matter of taste, and styles of painting fluctuate unevenly. Similarly, in institutions such as government and the economic system there are competing forms of styles, Governments may be dictatorships, oligarchies,

republics or democracies. Economic system includes communist, socialist, feudal, and capitalist ones. As far as can be told, there is no regular progression from one form of government or economic system to another. The obvious directional character of change in material culture is lacking in many areas of non-material culture.

Basic Concept

In addition to the difference in the directional character of change, Ogburn and others believe that material culture tends to change faster than non-material culture. Certainly one of the imperative aspects of modern American life is the tremendous development of technology. Within this century, life has been transformed by invention of the radio, TV, automobiles, airplanes, rockets, transistors, and computers and so on. While this has been happening in material culture, change in government, economic system, family life, education, and religion seems to have been much slower

This difference in rates of cultural change led Ogburn to formulate the concept of culture lag. Material inventions, he believed bring changes that require adjustments in various areas of non-material culture.Invention of the automobile, for instance, freed young people from direct parental observation, made it possible for them to work at distances from their homes, and, among other things, facilitated crime by making escape easier. Half a century earlier, families still were structured as they were in the era of the family farm when young people were under continuous observation and worked right on the homestead.

Culture lag is defined as the time between the appearance of a new material invention and the making of appropriate adjustments in corresponding area of non-material culture. This time is often long. It was over fifty years, for example, after the typewriter was invented before it was used systematically in offices. Even today, we may have a family system better adapted to a farm economy than to an urban industrial one, and nuclear weapons exist in a diplomatic atmosphere attuned to the nineteenth century. As the discussion implies, the concept of culture lag is associated with the definition of social problems. Scholars envision some balance or adjustment existing between material and non-material cultures. That balance is upset by the appearance of raw material objects. The resulting imbalance is defined as a social problem until non-material culture changes in adjustment to the new technology.

Cultural Relativism

This is a method whereby different societies or cultures are analyzed objectively without using the values of one culture to judge the worth of another. We cannot possibly understand the actions of other groups if we analyze them in terms of our motives and values. We must interpret their behavior in the light of their motives, habits and values if we are to understand them. Cultural relativism means that the function and meaning of a trait are relative to its cultural setting. A trait is neither good nor bad in itself. It is good or bad only with reference to the culture in which it is to function. Fur clothing is good in the

Arctic but not in the tropics. In some hunting societies which occasionally face long periods of hunger to be fat is good; it has real survival value and fat people are admired. In our society to be fat is not only unnecessary but is known to be unhealthful and fat people are not admired.

The concept of cultural relativism does not mean that all customs are equally valuable, nor does it imply that no customs are harmful. Some patterns of behavior may be injurious everywhere, but even such patterns serve some purpose in the culture and the society will suffer unless a substitute is provided. The central point in cultural relativism is that in a particular cultural setting certain traits are right because they work well in that setting while other traits are wrong because they would clash painfully with parts of that culture.

Ethnocentrism

Closely related to the concept of cultural relativity is the concept of ethnocentrism. The world ethno comes from Greek and refers to a people, nation, or cultural grouping, while centric comes from Latin and refers, of course to the centre. The term ethnocentrism then refers to the tendency for each society to place its own culture patterns at the centre of things.

Ethnocentrism is the practice of comparing other cultural practices with those of one's own and automatically finding those other cultural practices to be inferior. It is the habit of each group taking for granted the superiority of its culture. It makes our culture into a yardstick with which to measure all other cultures as good or bad, high or low, right or queer in proportion as they resemble ours.

Ethnocentrism is a universal human reaction found in all known societies, in all groups and in practically all individuals. Everyone learns ethnocentrism while growing up. The possessiveness of the small child quickly translates "into my toys are better than your toys" Parents; unless they are quite crude, outwardly discourage their children from verbalizing such beliefs. But in private, they may reassure their off springs that their possessions are indeed very nice. Much of the learning of ethnocentrism is indirect and unintended, but some of it is deliberate. History for example, is often taught to glorify the achievements of one's own nation, and religious, civic and other groups disparage their competitors openly. Among adults, ethnocentrism is simply a fact of life.

Once one becomes conscious of ethnocentrism, the temptation is strong to evaluate it in moral terms; to label it with epithets such as bigoted chauvinistic, and so on, and to imply that one who has not discovered and compensated for his or her ethnocentric biases is not worthy. This incidentally, is another form of ethnocentrism. The important point, however, is that ethnocentrism is one of the features of culture and , like the rest of culture , it needs to be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the maintenance of social order and the promotion of social change.

The functions of ethnocentrism in maintaining order are more apparent than those which promote social change. First, ethnocentrism encourages the solidarity of the group. Believing that one's own ways are the best, encourages a "we" feeling with associates and strengthens the idea that loyalty to comrades and preservation of the basis for superiority are important values. Positively, ethnocentrism promotes continuance of the status quo negatively, it discourages change.

Ethnocentrism

Second, ethnocentrism hinders the understanding of the cooperation with other groups. If the ways of one's own group are best, there is little incentive to interact with inferior groups. In fact, attitudes of suspicion, disdain and hostility are likely to be engendered
Extreme ethnocentrism is likely to promote conflict, as the records of past wars, and religious and racial conflicts reveal.

Conflict, of course often leads to social change and in that sense ethnocentrism becomes a vehicle for the promotion of social change. It does so, however, through encouragement of its peaceful evolution. There is little doubt that most social scientists are biased in favor of peaceful social change and are opposed to conflict. Consequently, they tend even if subtly, to denigrate ethnocentrisms and to imply that students must rid themselves of it if they are to learn effectively.

In so doing, sociologists operate implicitly from a combination of evolutionary and functionalist models. Recent years have seen this stance called into question. The revolutionary efforts of groups who see themselves as downtrodden blacks, the poor, women, and young people have included deliberate efforts to foster ethnocentrism as a means of strengthening themselves. Slogans such as' "black power" conflict model of society from which they operate.

Acculturation

This term is used to describe both the process of contacts between different cultures and also the customs of such contacts. As the process of contact between cultures, acculturation may involve either direct social interaction or exposure to other cultures by means of the mass media of communication. As the outcome of such contact, acculturation refers to the assimilation by one group of the culture of another which modifies the existing culture and so changes group identity. There may be a tension between old and new cultures which leads to the adapting of the new as well as the old.

From a purely sociological perspective, the terms "culture" and "acculturation" do not carry the negative connotations they often have in sectarian theological discourse. Culture refers to the total way of life of a human group or society, including its material products (tools, dwellings, clothing, etc.) and its nonmaterial products (language, ceremonies, beliefs, etc.). Every group, including the original group of Christ's disciples, has a culture, or subculture, e.g., the way the disciple group rooted its kingdom

lifestyle in its Jewish heritage.

Social Groups

A social group consists of two or more people who interact with one another and who recognize themselves as a distinct social unit. The definition is simple enough, but it has significant implications. Frequent interaction leads people to share values and beliefs. This similarity and the interaction cause them to identify with one another. Identification and attachment, in turn, stimulate more frequent and intense interaction. Each group maintains solidarity with all to other groups and other types of social systems.

Groups are among the most stable and enduring of social units. They are important both to their members and to the society at large. Through encouraging regular and predictable behavior, groups form the foundation upon which society rests. Thus, a family, a village, a political party a trade union is all social groups. These, it should be noted are different from social classes, status groups or crowds, which not only lack structure but whose members are less aware or even unaware of the existence of the group. These have been called quasi-groups or groupings. Nevertheless, the distinction between social groups and quasi-groups is fluid and variable since quasi-groups very often give rise to social groups, as for example, social classes give rise to political parties.
It is categorized into three groups:

Primary Groups
Secondary Groups
Reference Groups

Primary Groups

If all groups are important to their members and to society, some groups are more important than others. Early in the twentieth century, Charles H. Cooley gave the name, primary groups, to those groups that he said are characterized by intimate face-to-face association and those are fundamental in the development and continued adjustment of their members. He identified three basic primary groups, the family, the child's play group, and the neighborhoods or community among adults. These groups, he said, are almost universal in all societies; they give to people their earliest and most complete experiences of social unity; they are instrumental in the development of the social life; and they promote the integration of their members in the larger society.

Since Cooley wrote, over 65 years ago, life in the United States has become much more urban, complex,

and impersonal, and the family play group and neighborhood have become less dominant features of the social order. Secondary groups, characterized by anonymous, impersonal, and instrumental relationships, have become much more numerous. People move frequently, often from one section of the country to another and they change from established relationships and promoting widespread loneliness. Young people, particularly, turn to drugs, seek communal living groups and adopt deviant lifestyles in attempts to find meaningful primary-group relationships. The social context has changed so much so that primary group relationship today is not as simple as they were in Cooley's time.

Secondary groups

An understanding of the modern industrial society requires an understanding of the secondary groups. The social groups other than those of primary groups may be termed as secondary groups. They are a residual category. They are often called special interest groups. MacIver and Page refers to them as great associations.

They are of the opinion that secondary groups have become almost inevitable today. Their appearance is mainly due to the growing cultural complexity. Primary groups are found predominantly in societies where life is relatively simple. With the expansion in population and territory of a society however interests become diversified and other types of relationships which can be called secondary or impersonal become necessary. Interests become differentiated. The services of experts are required. The new range of the interests demands a complex organization. Especially selected persons act on behalf of all and hence arises a hierarchy of officials called bureaucracy. These features characterize the rise of the modern state, the great corporation, the factory, the labor union, a university or a nationwide political party and so on. These are secondary groups.Ogburn and Nimkoff defines secondary groups as groups which provide experience lacking in intimacy. Frank D. Watson writes that the secondary group is larger and more formal ,is specialized and direct in its contacts and relies more for unity and continuance upon the stability of its social organization than does the primary group.

Characteristics of secondary group:

Dominance of secondary relations: Secondary groups are characterized by indirect, impersonal, contractual and non-inclusive relations. Relations are indirect because secondary groups are bigger in size and members may not stay together. Relations are contractual in the sense they are oriented towards certain interests

Largeness of the size: Secondary groups are relatively larger in size. City, nation, political parties, trade unions and corporations, international associations are bigger in size. They may have thousands and

lakhs of members. There may not be any limit to the membership in the case of some secondary groups. Membership: Membership in the case of secondary groups is mainly voluntary. Individuals are at liberty to join or to go away from the groups. However there are some secondary groups like the state whose membership is almost involuntary.

No physical basis: Secondary groups are not characterized by physical proximity. Many secondary groups are not limited to any definite area. There are some secondary groups like the Rotary Club and Lions Club which are international in character. The members of such groups are scattered over a vast area.

Secondary groups

Specific ends or interest: Secondary groups are formed for the realization of some specific interests or ends. They are called special interest groups. Members are interested in the groups because they have specific ends to aim at. Indirect communication: Contacts and communications in the case of secondary groups are mostly indirect. Mass media of communication such as radio, telephone, television, newspaper, movies, magazines and post and telegraph are resorted to by the members to have communication.

Communication may not be quick and effective even. Impersonal nature of social relationships in secondary groups is both the cause and the effect of indirect communication.

Nature of group control: Informal means of social control are less effective in regulating the relations of members. Moral control is only secondary. Formal means of social control such as law, legislation, police, court etc are made of to control the behavior of members. The behavior of the people is largely influenced and controlled by public opinion, propaganda, rule of law and political ideologies.

Group structure: The secondary group has a formal structure. A formal authority is set up with designated powers and a clear-cut division of labor in which the function of each is specified in relation to the function of all. Secondary groups are mostly organized groups. Different statuses and roles that the members assume are specified. Distinctions based on caste, colour, religion, class, language etc are less rigid and there is greater tolerance towards other people or groups.

Limited influence on personality: Secondary groups are specialized in character. People involvement in them is also of limited significance.Members's attachment to them is also very much limited. Further people spend most of their time in primary groups than in secondary groups. Hence secondary groups have very limited influence on the personality of the members.

Reference Groups

According to Merton reference groups are those groups which are the referring points of the individuals, towards which he is oriented and which influences his opinion, tendency and behaviour.The individual is surrounded by countless reference groups. Both the memberships and inner groups and non memberships and outer groups may be reference groups.

Social System

A social system basically consists of two or more individuals interacting directly or indirectly in a bounded situation. There may be physical or territorial boundaries, but the fundamental sociological point of reference is that the individuals are oriented, in a whole sense, to a common focus or inter-related foci. Thus it is appropriate to regard such diverse sets of relationships as small groups, political parties and whole societies as social systems.

Social systems are open systems, exchanging information with, frequently acting with reference to other systems. Modern conceptions of the term can be traced to the leading social analysts of the nineteenth century, notably Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim; each of whom elaborated in some form or other conceptions of the major units of social systems (mainly societies) and the relationships between such units- even though the expression social system was not a key one.

Thus, in Marx's theory, the major units or components of the capitalist societies with which he was principally concerned were socio-economic classes, and the major relationships between classes involved economic and political power. The most influential conceptualization of the term has been that of Talcott Parsons. Parsons' devotion to this issue has two main aspects. First, what is called the problem of social order; i.e. the nature of the forces giving rise to relatively stable forms of social interaction and organization, and promoting orderly change. Parsons took Thomas Hobbes Leviathan, 1651, as his point of departure in this part of his analysis. Hobbes had maintained that man's fundamental motivation was the craving for power and that men were always basically in conflict with each other. Thus order could only exist in strong government.

To counter this Parsons invoked the work of Max Weber and, in particular, Durkheim, who had placed considerable emphasis on the functions of normative, factors in social life, such as ideals and values. Factors of this kind came to constitute the mainspring in Parsons Delineation of a social system. Thus in his major theoretical work, The Social system, 1951, he defines a social system as consisting in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors, who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the optimization of gratification and whose relations to their situations, including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols. The major units of a social system are said to be collectivities and roles (i.e. not individuals as such); and the major patterns or relationships linking these units are values (ends or broad guides to action) and norms (rules governing role performance in the context of system values).

Social System

Parsons second major interest has been to make sociology more scientific and systematic, by developing abstract conceptions of the social system; one of this points being that even though Weber placed much emphasis upon normative factors as guiding action, there was in Weber's sociology no elaboration of a theoretically integrated total system of action.

Hence the attempt to combine in one framework both a conception of actors in social situations and an overall, highly abstract, outside view of the major factors involved in a social system as a going concern. Various points in Parsons' formulation have been criticized. Notably, objections have been made to the emphasis upon normative regulation, and it has been alleged that Parsons neglected social conflict under the pressure of his systematic perspective; i.e. pre-occupation with system ness and analytical elegance which blinds the sociologist to disconsensus in real life and spurs him to stress integrative phenomena in his analyses. However, it is widely agreed that sociologists should operate with some clearly defined conception of what constitutes a social system. Thus, for many sociologists the term social system is not by any means restricted to those situations where there is binding normative regulation; but in order to qualify as social system it must involve a common focus, or set of foci, or orientations and a shared mode of communication among a majority of actors. Thus, on this basis there can be a system of conflict.

Social Distance

Bogardus developed the concept of social distance to measure the degree of closeness or acceptance we feel toward other groups. While most often used with reference to racial groups social distance refers to closeness between groups of all kinds. Social distance is measured either by direct observation of people interacting or more often by questionnaires in which people are asked what kind of people they would accept in particular relationships. In these questionnaires a number of groups may be listed and the informants asked to check whether they would accept a member of each group as a neighbor, as a fellow worker as a marriage partner and so on through a series of relationships. The social distance questionnaires may not accurately measure what people actually would do if a member of another group sought to become a friend or neighbour.The social distance scale is only an attempt to measure one's feeling of unwillingness to associate equally with a group. What a person will actually do in a situation also depends upon the circumstances of the situation.

Social Norms

Social norms grow out of social value and both serve to differentiate human social behavior from that of

other species. The significance of learning in behavior varies from species to species and is closely linked to processes of communication. Only human beings are capable of elaborate symbolic communication and of structuring their behavior in terms of abstract preferences that we have called values. Norms are the means through which values are expressed in behavior.

Norms generally are the rules and regulations that groups live by. Or perhaps because the words, rules and regulations, call to mind some kind of formal listing, we might refer to norms as the standards of behavior of a group. For while some of the appropriate standards of behavior in most societies are written down, many of them are not that formal. Many are learned, informally, in interaction with other people and are passed "that way from generation to generation.

The term "norms" covers an exceedingly wide range of behaviour. So that the whole range of that behaviour may be included. Sociologists have offered the following definition. Social norms are rules developed by a group of people that specify how people must, should, may, should not, and must not behave in various situations. Some norms are defined by individual and societies as crucial to the society. For example, all members of the group are required to wear clothing and to bury their dead. Such "musts" are often labeled "mores", a term coined by the American sociologist William Graham Sumner.

Many social norms are concerned with "should "; that is, there is some pressure on the individual to conform but there is some leeway permitted also. The 'should behaviors' are what Sumner called "folk-ways"; that is, conventional ways of doing things that are not defined as crucial to the survival of either the individual or the society. The 'should behaviors' in our own society include the prescriptions that people's clothes should be clean, and that death should be recognized with public funerals. A complete list of the should behaviors in a complex society would be virtually without end.

The word "May" in the definition of norms indicates that, in most groups, there is a wide range of behaviors in which the individual is given considerable choice. To continue the illustration, in Western countries girls may select to wear dresses or halters and jeans. Funerals may be held with or without flowers, with the casket open or closed, with or without religious participation, and so on. We have confined our examples to just two areas, but students should be able to construct their own examples from all areas of life.

Social Norms

The remainder of the definition, including the 'should-not' and the 'must-not' behaviours, probably does not require lengthy illustration because such examples are implicit in what has already been said. One should not belch in public, dump garbage in the street, run stop signs, or tell lies. One must not kill another person or have sexual intercourse with one's sister or brother.

Social norms cover almost every conceivable situation, and they vary from standards where almost complete conformity is demanded to those where there is great freedom of choice. Norms also vary in the kinds of sanctions that are attached to violation of the norms. Since norms derive from values, and since complex societies have multiple and conflicting value systems, it follows that norms frequently are in conflict also.

Taking the illustration of American sex norms, two proscriptive norms prohibit premarital intercourse and extramarital intercourse. But many boys also have been taught that sex is good and that they should seek to "score" with girls whenever possible. Somewhat similarly, girls have been taught that promiscuous intercourse before marriage is bad; but they have also been taught that sex is acceptable within true love relationships. Members of both sexes, then, find themselves faced with conflicting demands for participation in sex and for abstinence from it. They also discover that there are sanctions associated with either course of action.

Normative conflict is also deeply involved in social change. As statistical norms come to differ too blatantly from existing prescriptive norms, new prescriptive norms give sanction to formerly prohibited behaviour and even extend it. Recent changes in the sex norms of teenage and young adult groups provide examples. The change is more apparent in communal living groups where sometimes there is an explicit ideology of sexual freedom and the assumption that sexual activities will be shared with all members of the group. In less dramatic fashion, the change is evident among couples who simply begin to live together without the formality of a marriage ceremony.

Status and Role

The term has two sociological uses:

1. R. Linton (1936) defined status simply as a position in a social system, such as child or parent. Status refers to what a person is, whereas the closely linked notion of role refers to the behaviour expected of people in a status.

2. Status is also used as a synonym for honor or prestige, when social status denotes the relative position of a person on a publicly recognized scale or hierarchy of social worth. (See 'Social Stratification').

It is the first meaning of the term status, status as position, which we are going to refer to in the following paragraphs. Status as honour or prestige is a part of the study of social stratification.

A status is simply a rank or position that one holds in a group. One occupies the status of son or daughter, playmate, pupil, radical, militant and so on. Eventually one occupies the statuses of husband, mother bread-winner, cricket fan, and so on, one has as many statuses as there are groups of which one is a member. For analytical purposes, statuses are divided into two basic types:

• Ascribed and
• Achieved.

Ascribed Statuses

Ascribed statuses are those which are fixed for an individual at birth. Ascribed statuses that exist in all societies include those based upon sex, age, race ethnic group and family background.

Similarly, power, prestige, privileges, and obligations always are differentially distributed in societies by the age of the participants. This has often been said about the youth culture in the U.S. because of the high value Americans attach to being young. Pre-modern China, by contrast, attached the highest value to old age and required extreme subordination of children. The perquisites and obligations accompany age change over the individual's lifetime, but the individual proceeds inexorably through these changes with no freedom of choice.

As the discussion implies, the number and rigidity of ascribed statuses vary from one society to another. Those societies in which many statuses are rigidly prescribed and relatively unchangeable are called caste societies, or at least, caste like. Among major nations, India is a caste society. In addition to the ascribed statuses already discussed, occupation and the choice of marriage partners in traditional India are strongly circumscribed by accident of birth. Such ascribed statuses stand in contrast to achieved statuses.

Achieved Statuses

Achieved statuses are those which the individual acquires during his or her lifetime as a result of the exercise of knowledge, ability, skill and/or perseverance. Occupation provides an example of status that may be either ascribed or achieved, and which serves to differentiate caste-like societies from modern ones. Societies vary in both the number of statuses that are ascribed and achieved and in the rigidity with which such definitions are held. Both ascribed and achieved statuses exist in all societies. However, an understanding of a specific society requires that the interplay among these be fully understood. For Weber class is a creation of the market situation. Class operates in society independently of any valuations. As Weber did not believe in the economic phenomena determining human ideals, he distinguishes status situation from class situation.

According to Linton, status is associated with distinctive beliefs about the expectations of those having status, as for example, the status of children. Other common bases for status are age, sex, birth, genealogy and other biological constitutional characteristics. However, status, according to Linton, is only a phenomenon, not the intrinsic characteristic of man but of social organization. What matters is not what you really are, but what people believe you to be. At times, some confuse the two terms, status and role. Status defines who a person is, as for example, he is a child or a Negro, or a doctor;

whereas, role defines what such a person is expected to do, as for example, he is too young to work, he should care about parents etc.

A common method of identifying the statuses in a social system is to discover the list of status-designators, as for example, kinship status typically begins with a list of kin terms and their usage. One other characteristic feature of status, as understood today, is that any person can have more than one status. Generally, no status in any social situation encompasses one person. Also, it has to be kept in mind those statuses and persons are not only distinct concepts but also at distinct levels of analysis. Besides, in sociology it is status, rather than person, which is more useful as a tool of analysis.

Why we should treat these two terms as separate can be argued on various grounds. First, two persons having quite different characters may possess similar observable conduct if they have the same status, as for example, very acquisitive and very altruistic doctors may behave in much the same way. Secondly, two persons having the same character, very often, have different observable conduct because of having two different statuses.

Achieved Statuses

Thirdly, even two persons having similar characters but having two different statuses show very often different observable conduct, as for example, a docile son and a kind father.

Thus, in society, which in reality is a social system where interaction occurs between actors, status but not person in important. If we treat person as the unit of such a system we must discover a basic personality structure which is an impossible task. On the other hand, it is easy to comprehend status although it is an abstract concept. Status is the most elementary component of the social system which is equally abstract.

Interaction between two actors occurs not as persons but as two having statuses. A social position is always defined in relation to a counter position, as for example, a doctor to a patient, to a nurse, and to the hospital administrator. In other words, the basic unit of analysis for social system is not status itself but the relation of two statuses. The first writer to do considerable work in this field was Merton in 1957. According to him, there are three aspects of status. To illustrate, Mr. Pandey is a doctor must have social relations with nurses, patients, other doctors, hospital administrators, and so on, that is, a role set. If Mr. Pandey is also a husband, a father, a member of Hare-Krishna cult and a municipal councilor, it is a status set. And the process, by which Mr. Pandey became a doctor, required that he first be a medical student, then an intern and then a resident, that is, a status sequence. Since what is known as status is related to other statuses, the interaction of statuses is a very crucial one. Stable interaction systems depend on the emergence of normative expectations. Once it emerges, such expectations are not created anew every time. Two new actors encounter each other. The idea underlying this statement is that every actor is sensitive to the attitudes others will have towards him. Every actor, therefore, tends to feel tense and upset if he is unable to define the social situation in such a way that the behaviour of the other is predictable.

A more dynamic feature of this series of social interactions is the idea that each action implies a status

and each status action. Therein each actor reveals how he defines a situation by the way he behaves, and thus provides other actors with cues to their own statuses in the situation.

Although the interaction of statuses is normally satisfactory, at times, confusion might arise because of status ambiguity. If, however, an actor has more than one status, the attitudes of any two statuses may be either compatible or incompatible with their demands on the person. If two statuses that are activated in the same situation are incompatible it would be difficult for each status occupant to know how to interact with the other, because it will be difficult for him to know which status is the basis of their interaction. Such ambiguities are a source of strain and discomfort and people either get out of such situations or wish that they be changed.

Achieved Statuses

The importance of role was recognized from 1936 when Linton presented the first systematic statement identifying role as a segment of culture. He also held the view that role was related to social status. Much work has been done after Linton in the form of experimental study. Many studies have shown that lack of clarity and consensus in role conceptions is a contributory factor in reducing organizational effectiveness and morale.

Since the concept is being extensively used, some differences appear in its usage. Some writers treat role and actual behavior of an individual to be one and the same. Most of the writers treat role as expected behavior and role behavior as an enactment. Another interpretation is that role is a specific behavior or conditioned response. Finally, some treat role as a part to be learnt and played.

Despite these differences, all sociologists agree to the following characteristics of role. It is believed that when roles are stabilized, the role structure persists regardless of changes in the actors. In some families when the parents become disorganized and become childish, a child suddenly blossoms into responsibility and helps to supply the family leadership. As the roles get stabilized, an individual adopts a given role; and if he fails to fulfill the role expectation, he will be regarded as a violator of the terms of interaction.

The above functioning of the role is determined, to some extent, by the organizational setting which supplies both direction and constraint to the working of the as for said processes. If the role structure is incorporated in an organizational setting, the latter's goals tend to become the crucial criteria for role differentiation, legitimacy of expectation, and judgments of adequacy.

Secondly, depending on the level of integration with the organizational setting, roles get linked with statuses in the organization.

Thirdly, depending on the extent to which the roles are incorporated with an organizational setting, each tends to develop a pattern of adaptation to incorporate other roles. A teacher in a public school must incorporate within his role pattern, his role adaptations to pupils, parents, other teachers and the

principal. Merton describes several mechanisms that are employed to minimize conflict in the role-set.

Achieved Statuses
Fourthly, when roles are incorporated with the organisational setting they persist as tradition and formalization. Finally, the place of role is determined by society itself; for, society is based on accommodation among many organizations. Society introduces multiple organisational references for roles, and multiplies roles for the actor.

A view from society's perspective shows that roles in different contexts tend to become merged. One example is our tendency to speak of male and female roles of heroic and unheroic roles while seeking meaning and order in simple human interactions. Viewed from the perspective of society, differentiation of roles gets linked with social values. If the societies and the individuals' assigned roles are consistent with each other the roles tend to get merged with social values. A glaring example is our tendency to use age, sex and occupation as qualifying criteria for the allocation of other roles.

In the end we have to say that it is actor who faces the strain; for, the dynamic hinges on his management of the several roles in his repertoire. This may come about through failure of role cues, gross lack of consensus and so forth. This situation results in an individual adopting his own repertoire of role relationship as a framework for his own behaviour, and as a perspective for the interpretation of the behaviour of others. When the individual forms a self-conception by selective identification of certain roles as his own to be held in his repertoire, the individual is said to develop a sense of personal prestige, which is likely to be reflected in his bearing, his self-assurance and other aspects of his interpersonal relations.

In general, the concept of role is crucial in all sociological analyses which attempt to link the functioning of the social orders with the characteristics and behaviour of the individuals who belong to that order. A study of roles provides a comprehensive pattern of social behaviour and attitudes. It constitutes a strategy for coping with a recurrent type of situation. It is socially identified as an entity. It can be played recognizably by different individuals, and it supplies a major basis for identifying and placing persons in a society.

Conflict

Conflict is goal-oriented, just as cooperation and competition are, but, there is a difference, in conflict, one seeks deliberately to harm and/ or destroy one's antagonists. The rules of competition always include restrictions upon the injury that may be done to a foe. But in conflict these rules break down; one seeks to win at any cost. In talking about conflict, the notion of a continuum or scale is again useful.

It is useful in at least two ways: in differentiating conflict from competition; and in differentiating

personal form group and organizational conflict. If we have the data with which to do it, all rival situations probably could be ranged along a continuum defined at one end by pure competition and at the other end by pure conflict. There might be a few situations that would be located near to each end of the continuum, but many would prove to be mixed types and would cluster near the centre. Conflict also tends to be more or less personal, just as is the case with cooperation and competition. First, fights and 'shoot-out' illustrate highly personal conflicts. The conflicts within football games generally are a little less personal, and the conflict between students and campus police at a sit-in or rally is personal. Yet, when two labor unions or two corporations set out to destroy each other, personal conflict may be almost completely submerged in organizational struggle. Perhaps the most impersonal of all conflicts is war between nations, where the enemy is perceived to be almost faceless. Again, rather than being discrete types of personal and impersonal conflicts, conflicts probably range almost imperceptibly along a continuum from the purely personal to the completely impersonal.

Probably the most striking thing about conflict is its destructive potential. The word 'conflict' itself often conjures up images of heads being broken, of buildings burning, and of deaths and destruction. Moreover, the destructiveness that accompanies conflicts quickly cumulates. In a confrontation between police and students, for example, things may be orderly until the first blow is struck. Once that happens, however, a frenzy of skull cracking, shootings, burning, and destroying may follow. Because the immediate results of conflict often are so horrible, there is a tendency to see it, not as a normal and universal process of social interaction, but as pathological process. It is very difficult for the unsophisticated not to imply value judgments in discussing these social processes because our society as a whole tends to do so. Cooperation and competition are more often perceived to be socially useful; but conflict, to be harmful.

The situation, however, it is not that simple. Few would defend the cooperation of a group of men in the rape of a woman. And the school drop-out problem is hardly a beneficial effect of competition. Thus, competition and cooperation, which otherwise receive a good deal of social approval, also have untoward effects. So it is, also with conflict. Conflict is an abnormal and universal form of social interaction as are any of the others. Analysis of conflict needs to describe both the ways in which it is harmful and destructive and the way in which it is useful and socially integrative

Harmful Effects of Conflict

The harmful effects probably are easier to see. We have already indicated that conflict tends to cumulate rapidly. This snowballing tendency may lead to complete breakdown before the self-limiting features of most inter-personal exchanges have a chance to operate. Before people can decide that the pain is not worth it, people may have been killed and property destroyed. Establishments may be closed or they may find themselves in chaos. Similarly, a company of soldiers may shoot down women and children in an orgy of destruction.

A second negative feature of conflict, closely related to the first, is that it is often extremely costly. War

probably provides the best example, for nothing else in human experience exacts such a toll. The third negative feature has to do with social costs. Conflict is inherently divisive. It sets person against person and group against group in ways that threaten to destroy organized social life. United States has seen conflict so widespread as to raise questions whether anarchy might prevail. Youth against the establishment, blacks against whites, the poor against the affluent, and Jews against Arabs represent something of the range of conflicts. In such situations, the question becomes not simply how many people will be killed, how much property destroyed, or who will win; it becomes one of the societal survival. Can race wars be avoided? Can the police maintain order? Can universities operate? And can presidents keep the support of the populace? Whatever else they may be, these are real questions. And the answers are by no means obvious. Conflict threatens the existence of society itself.

Useful Functions of Conflict

The explosiveness, the outward costs, and the divisiveness of conflict are so great that it is often difficult to see the ways in which conflict fulfils socially useful functions. Yet it does at least the following three things. First, it promotes loyalty within the group. Second, it signals the needs for and helps promote short-run social change. And third, it appears intimately involved in moving societies towards new levels of social integration. If conflict pits groups and organizations against one another, it also tends to promote unity within each of the conflicting groups. The necessity to work together against a common foe submerges rivalries within the group and people, who otherwise are competitors, to work together in harmony. Competing football halfbacks flock for each other, rival student leaders work together to win concessions from the administration, and union leaders join forces against management. Nations that are torn by dissent in peacetime rally together when they are attacked by other countries. Thus, conflict is not simply divisive, it works to unify groups.

A second positive function of conflict is that it serves to notify the society that serious problems exist that is not being handled by the traditional social organization. It forces the recognition of those problems and encourages the development of new solutions to them.

The third general positive function of conflict is closely related to the second. And it is much more problematic. One view of human history tends to focus upon conflict particularly upon war - as a primary mechanism through which nations have developed. In other words, war was the mechanism that permitted the consolidation of scattered, weak societies into large, powerful ones. Similar arguments have been advanced that war was necessary during the early modern period in Europe to permit the formation of nations as we know them.

Social Mobility

Introduction

Individuals are recognized in society through the statuses they occupy and the roles they enact.
The society as well as individuals is dynamic. Men are normally engaged in endless endeavor to enhance their statuses in society, move from lower position to higher position, secure superior job from an inferior one. For various reasons people of the higher status and position may be forced to come down to a lower status and position. Thus people in society continue to move up and down the status scale. This movement is called social mobility.

The study of social mobility is an important aspect of social stratification.Infact it is an inseparable aspect of social stratification system because the nature, form, range and degree of social mobility depends on the very nature of stratification system. Stratification system refers to the process of placing individuals in different layers or strata.

According to Wallace and Wallace social mobility is the movement of a person or persons from one social status to another.W.P Scott has defined sociology as the movement of an individual or group from one social class or social stratum to another.

Types of Social Mobility

Horizontal And Vertical Social Mobility
A distinction is made between horizontal and vertical social mobility. The former refers to change of occupational position or role of an individual or a group without involving any change in its position in the social hierarchy, the latter refers essentially to changes in the position of an individual or a group along the social hierarchy. When a rural laborer comes to the city and becomes an industrial worker or a manager takes a position in another company there are no significant changes in their position in the hierarchy. Those are the examples of horizontal mobility. Horizontal mobility is a change in position without the change in statue. It indicates a change in position within the range of the same status.

It is a movement from one status to its equalivalent.But if an industrial worker becomes a businessman or lawyer he has radically changed his position in the stratification system. This is an example of vertical mobility. Vertical mobility refers to a movement of an individual or people or groups from one status to another. It involves change within the lifetime of an individual to a higher or lower status than the person had to begin with.

Forms Of Vertical Social Mobility

The vertical mobility can take place in two ways - individuals and groups may improve their position in the hierarchy by moving upwards or their position might worsen and they may fall down the hierarchy When individuals get into seats of political position; acquire money and exert influence over others because of their new status they are said to have achieved individual mobility.

Like individuals even groups also attain high social mobility. When a dalit from a village becomes an important official it is a case of upward mobility. On the other hand an aristocrat or a member of an upper class may be dispossessed of his wealth and he is forced to enter a manual occupation. This is an example of downward mobility.

Inter-Generational Social Mobility

Time factor is an important element in social mobility. On the basis of the time factor involved in social mobility there is another type of inter-generational mobility. It is a change in status from that which a child began within the parents, household to that of the child upon reaching adulthood. It refers to a change in the status of family members from one generation to the next.

For example a farmer's son becoming an officer. It is important because the amount of this mobility in a society tells us to what extent inequalities are passed on from one generation to the next. If there is very little inter-generational mobility .inequality is clearly deeply built into the society for people' life chances are being determined at the moment of birth. When there is a mobility people are clearly able to achieve new statuses through their own efforts, regardless of the circumstances of their birth.

Intra-Generational Mobility

Mobility taking place in personal terms within the lifespan of the same person is called intra-generational mobility. It refers to the advancement in one's social level during the course of one's lifetime. It may also be understood as a change in social status which occurs within a person's adult career. For example a person working as a supervisor in a factory becoming its assistant manager after getting promotion.

Structural mobility

Structural mobility is a kind of vertical mobility. Structural mobility refers to mobility which is brought about by changes in stratification hierarchy itself. It is a vertical movement of a specific group, class or occupation relative to others in the stratification system. It is a type of forced mobility for it takes place because of the structural changes and not because of individual attempts. For example historical circumstances or labor market changes may lead to the rise of decline of an occupational group within the social hierarchy. An influx of immigrants may also alter class alignments -especially if the new arrivals are disproportionately highly skilled or unskilled.

Systems of Social Mobility

Open And Closed Systems Of Mobility

A closed system of mobility is that where norms prescribe mobility.

hierarchy. It justifies the inequality in the distribution of means of production status symbols and power positions and discourages any attempt to change them. Any attempt to bring about changes in such a system or to promote mobility is permanently suppressed.

In such a system individuals are assigned their place in the social structure on the basis of ascriptive criteria like age, birth, sex.Considerations of functional suitability or ideological notions of equality of opportunity are irrelevant in deciding the positions of individuals to different statuses. However no system in reality is perfectly close. Even in the most rigid systems of stratification limited degree of mobility exists. Traditional caste system in India is an example of closed system.

In the open system the norms prescribed and encourage mobility. There are independent principles of ranking like status, class and power. In and open system individuals are assigned to different positions in the social structure on the basis of their merit or achievement.

Open systems mobility is generally characterized with occupational diversity, a flexible hierarchy, differentiated social structure and rapidity of change. In such systems the hold of ascription based corporate groups like caste, kinship or extended family etc declines. The dominant values in such a system emphasize on equality and freedom of the individual and on change and innovation.

City and village: Continuity and change in social mobility

More striking than new opportunities for group mobility within the traditional status hierarchy has been the appearance in recent decades of new status hierarchies-new arenas for status competition. They have emerged from the impact of urbanization and westernization but are not independent of the traditional social organization in which they are based.

Urbanism is nothing new in India but rapid urbanization is new. The emergency of industrial employment, of easy communication over long distances, of increasingly efficient distribution of goods and services and of more effective centralized administration has made urban living a more accessible alternative to more people in India than ever before.

Urban life affords a measure of independence from the ties and constraints of membership in rural

based social groups by granting a degree of individual anonymity and mobility quite unattainable in rural communities.Caste, religion, ritual, tradition and the social controls implicit therein are not as rigid or pervasive in the city. People are increasingly able to seek status and other rewards on an individual or small family basis largely independent of caste or the other larger social entities of which they are also a part. They do this primarily by going to the city although the values of the city also extend into the country-side and have loosened the hold of tradition even there.

According to Harold Gould industrialization brought about the transfer of specialized occupations of all kinds from the context of the kin groups to factories organized on bureaucratic principles. This meant that occupational role and role occupant would be in principle separated and that the preponderant criteria for determining occupations would be performance qualities and that economic rewards and social mobility would constitute the principle standards for evaluating the worth or the status of any given role.

Traditional status -caste status does not disappear in the city. It remains important in the most private contexts; the family and neighborhood. Some neighborhoods essentially reproduce the village setting in personnel as well as social structure; others do not.

A very large proportion of city dwellers are in close touch with their native villages. Tradition and ascription are important in the city in those relationships upon which the day to day functioning and future composition of the family depends of which the epitome is marriage. In the city primary relationships occupy a diminishing proportion of most people's time, attention and energies.

Much of the individual's interaction takes place on the basis of particular or even fragmented roles. He can often behave in a way consistent with the requirements of the situation without reference to his group membership. He is even able to pass if that is his desire by learning the superficial symbols of the status such as that of white collar worker, student, middle class householder or professional. In these statuses skill in handling the language, in pursuing the occupation or success in acquiring money or an appropriate life style may be socially recognized and rewarded irrespective of caste and family.

Contemporary urban life has available more means to mobility and suggests to those who seek it a greater likelihood of success that the highly structured closely controlled traditional village setting. Mobility occurs in all settings. Some low status groups have been victims of technological displacement with the result that their economic, political and social statuses have declined.

They drift either into the status of rural landless laborers or into unskilled urban employment, both of which are overpopulated and underpaid. The result is underemployment, unemployment, poverty and

lack of opportunity for improvement. For examples: water carriers comprise a caste whose members have been displaced in many parts of Northern India with the advent of handpumps.In some instances

new occupations have been created and with them opportunities for enhancement of economic and social status thus allowing certain mobility.

Marriage, Family and Kinship

Marriage Types and Norms

Marriage is one of the universal social institutions established to control and regulate the life of mankind. It is closely associated with the institution of family.Infact both the institutions are complementary to each other. It is an institution with different implications in different cultures.

Its purposes, functions and forms may differ from society to society but it is present everywhere as an institution. Westermarck in 'History of Human marriage' defines marriage as the more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of offspring. According to Malinowski marriage is a contract for the production and maintenance of children. Robert Lowie describes marriage as a relatively permanent bond between permissible mates. For Horton and Hunt marriage is the approved social pattern whereby two or more persons establish a family.

Types of marriages

Polygyny:

It is a form of marriage in which one man marries more than one woman at a given time. It is of two types --- Sororal polygyny and non sororal polygyny

Sororal polygyny:

It is a type of marriage in which the wives are invariably the sisters. It is often called sororate.

Non-sororal polygyny:

It is a type of marriage in which the wives are not related as sisters.

Polyandry:

It is the marriage of one woman with more than one man. It is less common than polygyny. It is of two

types---- Fraternal Polyandry and non fraternal polyandry.

Fraternal polyandry:

When several brothers share the same wife the practice can be called alelphic or fraternal polyandry. This practice of being mate, actual or potential to one's husband's brothers is called levirate. It is prevalent among Todas.

[**B] Non - fraternal polyandry:** [/B]

In this type the husband need not have any close relationship prior to the marriage. The wife goes to spend some time with each husband. So long as a woman lives with one of her husbands; the others have no claim over her.

Monogamy:
It is a form of marriage in which one man marries one woman .It is the most common and acceptable form of marriage.

Serial monogamy:
In many societies individuals are permitted to marry again often on the death of the first spouse or after divorce but they cannot have more than one spouse at one and the same time.

Straight monogamy:

In this remarriage is not allowed.

Group Marriage:
It means the marriage of two or more women with two or more men. Here the husbands are common husbands and wives are common wives. Children are regarded as the children of the entire group as a whole.

Rules of Marriage

No society gives absolute freedom to its members to select their partners. Endogamy and exogamy are the two main rules that condition marital choice.

Endogamy:

It is a rule of marriage in which the life-partners are to be selected within the group. It is marriage within the group and the group may be caste, class, tribe, race, village, religious group etc.We have caste endogamy, class endogamy, sub caste endogamy, race endogamy and tribal endogamy etc.In caste endogamy marriage has to take place within the caste. Brahmin has to marry a Brahmin. In sub caste endogamy it is limited to the sub caste groups.

Exogamy:

It is a rule of marriage in which an individual has to marry outside his own group. It prohibits marrying within the group. The so-called blood relatives shall neither have marital connections nor sexual contacts among themselves.

Forms of exogamy:

Gotra Exogamy: The Hindu practice of one marrying outside one's own gotra.

Pravara Exogamy: Those who belong to the same pravara cannot marry among themselves.

Village Exogamy: Many Indian tribes like Naga,Garo,Munda etc have the practice of marrying outside their village.

Pinda Exogamy: Those who belong to the same panda or sapinda(common parentage) cannot marry within themselves.

Isogamy: It is the marriage between two equals (status)

Anisogamy: It is an asymmetric marriage alliance between two individuals belonging to different social statuses. It is of two forms - Hypergamy and Hypogamy.

superior caste or family.

Hypogamy: It is the marriage of high caste man with a low caste woman.

Orthogamy: It is the marriage between selected groups.

Cerogamy: It is two or more men get married to two or more women.

Anuloma marriage: It is a marriage under which a man can marry from his own caste or from those below, but a woman can marry only in her caste or above.

Pratiloma marriage: It is a marriage of a woman to a man from a lower caste which is not permitted.

Muslim Marriage

In the Muslim community marriage is universal for it discourages celibacy. Muslims call their marriage Nikah. Marriage is regarded not as a religious sacrament but as a secular bond. The bridegroom makes a proposal to the bride just before the wedding ceremony in the presence of two witnesses and a maulavi or kazi.The proposal is called ijab and its acceptance is called qubul.

It is necessary that both the proposal and its acceptance must take place at the same meeting to make it a sahi Nikah.It is a matter of tradition among the Muslims to have marriage among equals. Though there is no legal prohibition to contract marriage with a person of low status, such marriages are looked down upon.

The run-away marriages called kifa when the girls run away with boys and marry them on their own choice are not recognized. Marrying idolaters and slaves is also not approved. There is also provision of preferential system in mate selection. The parallel cousins and cross cousins are allowed to get married.

Marriage that is held contrary to the Islamic rules is called batil or invalid marriage.Meher or dower is a practice associated with Muslim marriage. It is a sum of money or other property which a wife is entitled to get from her husband in consideration of the marriage.

Muta is a special type of marriage for pleasure which is for a specified period only.Iddat is the period of seclusion for three menstrual periods for a woman after the death /divorce by her husband to ascertain whether she is pregnant or not. Only after this period she can remarry.

Muslim marriage can be dissolved in the following ways:

Divorce as per the Muslim law but without the intervention of the court: They are of two types-Kula where divorce is initiated at the instance of the wife and Mubarat where initiative may come either from the wife or from the husband.

Talaq represents one of the ways according to which a Muslim husband can give divorce to his wife as per the Muslim law by repeating the dismissal formula thrice. The talaq may be affected either orally by making some pronouncements or in writing by presenting talaqnama.

Divorce as recognized by Shariah Act 1937 provides for three forms of divorce:Illa,Zihar and Lian.There is also provision of divorce as per the Dissolution of Muslim Marriage Act 1939.

Family

The family forms the basic unit of social organization and it is difficult to imagine how human society

could function without it. The family has been seen as a universal social institution an inevitable part of human society.

According to Burgess and Lock the family is a group of persons united by ties of marriage, blood or adoption constituting a single household interacting with each other in their respective social role of husband and wife, mother and father, brother and sister creating a common culture.

G.P Murdock defines the family as a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship and one or more children own or adopted of the sexually co-habiting adults.

Nimkoff says that family is a more or less durable association of husband and wife with or without child or of a man or woman alone with children. According to Maclver family is a group defined by sex relationships sufficiently precise and enduring to provide for the procreation and upbringing of children.Kingsley Davis describes family as a group of persons whose relations to one another are based upon consanguinity and who are therefore kin to one another.

Malinowski opined that the family is the institution within which the cultural traditions of a society is handed over to a newer generation. This indispensable function could not be filled unless the relations to parents and children were relations reciprocally of authority and respect. According to Talcott Parsons families are factories which produce human personalities.

Main characteristics of family

Universality:

There is no human society in which some form of the family does not appear.Malinowski writes the typical family a group consisting of mother, father and their progeny is found in all communities,savage,barbarians and civilized. The irresistible sex need, the urge for reproduction and the common economic needs have contributed to this universality

emotional basis:

The family is grounded in emotions and sentiments. It is based on our impulses of mating, procreation, maternal devotion, fraternal love and parental care. It is built upon sentiments of love, affection, sympathy, cooperation and friendship.

Limited size:

The family is smaller in size. As a primary group its size is necessarily limited. It is a smallest social unit.

Formative influence:

The family welds an environment which surrounds trains and educates the child. It shapes the personality and moulds the character of its members. It emotionally conditions the child.

Nuclear position in the social structure:

The family is the nucleus of all other social organizations. The whole social structure is built of family units.

Responsibility of the members:

The members of the family has certain responsibilities, duties and obligations.MacIver points out that in times of crisis men may work and fight and die for their country but they toil for their families all their lives.

Social regulation:

The family is guarded both by social taboos and by legal regulations. The society takes precaution to safeguard this organization from any possible breakdown.

Types and forms of the family

On the basis of marriage, family has been classified into three major types:

• Polygamous or polygynous family

• Polyandrous family On the basis of the nature of residence family can be classified into three main forms.

• Family of matrilocal residence

• Family of patrilocal residence

• Family of changing residence

On **the basis of ancestry or descent family** can be classified into two main types

• Matrilineal family

• Patrilineal family

On the basis of size or structure and the depth of generations family can be classified into two main types.

• Nuclear or the single unit family

• Joint family

On the basis of the nature of relations among the family members the family can be classified into two main types.

• The conjugal family which consists of adult members among there exists sex relationship.

• Consanguine family which consists of members among whom there exists blood relationship- brother and sister, father and son etc.

Kinship

Kinship is the relation by the bond of blood, marriage and includes kindered ones. It represents one of the basic social institutions. Kinship is universal and in most societies plays a significant role in the socialization of individuals and the maintenance of group solidarity. It is very important in primitive societies and extends its influence on almost all their activities.A.R Radcliffe Brown defines kinship as a system of dynamic relations between person and person in a community, the behavior of any two persons in any of these relations being regulated in some way and to a greater or less extent by social usage.

Affinal and Consanguineous kinship

Relation by the bond of blood is called consanguineous kinship such as parents and their children and between children of same parents. Thus son, daughter, brother, sister, paternal uncle etc are consanguineous kin. Each of these is related through blood. Kinship due to marriage is affinal kinship. New relations are created when marriage takes place. Not only man establishes relationship with the girl and the members of her but also family members of both the man and the woman get bound among themselves. Kinship includes Agnates (sapindas, sagotras); cognates (from mother's side) and bandhus (atamabandhus, pitrubandhus, and matrubandhus).

Descent

A descent group is any social group in which membership depends on common descent from a real or

mythical ancestor. Thus a lineage is a unilineal descent group in which membership may rest either on matrilineal descent (patrilineage) or on matrilineal descent (matrilineage). In a cognatic descent, all descendants of an ancestor\ancestress enjoy membership of a common descent group by virtue of any combination of male or female linkages. However, cognatic descent is sometimes used synonymously with either 'bilateral' or 'consanguine descent.

A clan is a unilineal descent groups the members of which may claim either partilineal (Patriclan) or matrilineal descent (Matriclan) from a founder, but do not know the genealogical ties with the ancestor\ancestress. A phratry is a grouping of clans which are related by traditions of common descent. Mythical ancestors are thus common in clans and phratries. Totemic clans, in which membership is periodically reinforced by common rituals such as sacred meals, have been of special interest to social anthropologists and sociologists of religion. Where the descent groups of a society are organized into two main divisions, these are known as moieties (halves). The analysis of descent groups is crucial for any anthropological study of pre-industrial society, but in most Western industrial societies the principle of descent is not prominent and descent groups are uncommon.

Primary, secondary and tertiary kins

Primary kins:

Every individual who belong to a nuclear family finds his primary kins within the family. There are 8 primary kins- husband-wife, father-son, mother-son, father-daughter, mother-daughter, younger brother-elder brother, younger sister-elder sister and brother-sister.

Secondary kins:

Outside the nuclear family the individual can have 33 types of secondary relatives. For example mother's brother, brother's wife, sister's husband, father's brother.

Tertiary kins:

Tertiary kins refer to the secondary kins of our primary kins.For example wife's brother's son, sister's husband's brother and so on. There are 151 types of tertiary kins.

Kinship Usages:

Kinship usages or the rules of kinship are significant in understanding kinship system. They serve two main purposes:

• They create groups or special groupings or kin. For example- family extended family, clan etc.

• Kinship rules govern the role of relationships among the kins.

Kinship usage provides guidelines for interaction among persons in these social groupings. It defines proper and acceptable role relationships. Thus it acts as a regulator of social life. Some of these relationships are: avoidance, teknonymy, avunculate, amitate, couvades and joking relationship.

Things to Remember

• A person referred to as the parent of his or her child indicates the practice of Teknonymy.
• Rivers has given the explanation of kinship terms referring to social usages which are antecedent to their use.
• The residence rule which gives choice to the newly -weds to live with the parents of either the groom or the bride is known as biolocal.
• When both patrilineal and matrilineal rules apply jointly it is called double descent.
• Rivers has defined the clan as an exogamous division of tribe.
• Social recognition is important in determining consanguineous kinship.
• In double descent system one inherits fathers' patrilineal relatives and mother's matrilineal relatives.
• Maclver said that kinship creates society and society creates the state.
• Weiser stressed that clan is usually associated with totemism.
• Levi Strauss has regarded preferential mating as a device for strengthening group solidarity.
• Westermarck has written the history of human marriage.
• Westermarck has listed various causes of polygyny including variety of women.
• Murdock has distinguished between the family of orientation and the family of procreation.
• Morgan suggested historical evolution of the form of marriage and family.
• Tribes such as Mundas and Nagas do not permit marriage between persons from the same village.
• According to Westermarck marriage is itself rooted in the family rather than family in marriage.
• According to D.N Majumdar the Hindu society presently recognizes only two forms of marriage the Brahma and Asura.
• A Tarawad splits into smaller units called Tavazhis.
• When one becomes the member of the consanguineal relatives of both father and mother, it is known as bilateral descent.
• The rule of residence generally followed in India is patrilocal.
• When not mutual, a joking relationship assumes the form of social control.
• Where father's sister is given more respect than the mother the relationship is called amitate.
• Neolocal rule of residence is generally followed in western countries.
• People bond together in groups based on reproduction refers to kinship.

• Experimental marriage is known as privileged relationship.
• Marriage of one man with a woman and her several sisters are called sororal polygamy.
• The marriage of a Hindu is illegal if his or her spouse is alive. This restriction is according to Hindu Marriage Act.
• Marriage of a man of high caste with a woman of lower caste is called Anuloma marriage.
• Levi Strauss believed that no society was perfectly unilineal.
• Radcliff Brown introduced the term lineage group to designate the living members of a group.
• Morgan believed the earliest form of kin group to be the clan.
• Rivers has listed belief in common descent and possession of a common totem as characterizing a clan.
• Murdock has called the clan a compromise kin group.
• Radcliffe Brown defines sib as a consanguineous group not sharing a common residence.
• Horton and Hunt described the marriage as the approved social pattern whereby two or more persons establish a family.
• A nomenclature of the family function is symbolic of system to reckoning descent.